



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,713	12/24/2003	Hiroshi Kamikawa	Q79192	8326
23373	7590	09/14/2005	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			HESS, BRUCE H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1774	

DATE MAILED: 09/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/743,713	KAMIKAWA, HIROSHI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Bruce H. Hess	1774

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5-24-04 (Priority)

2a)  This action is FINAL. 2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s)        is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s)        is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s)        is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s)        are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on        is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:

1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.       .

3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date

- 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date
- 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6)  Other:

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the patent to Hosoi et al. (USP 5,525,571).

This patent suggests heat-sensitive recording material which can employ microcapsules having different particle diameters (see column 11, lines 44-56 and in particular lines 45,46,49 and 50 wherein microcapsules having small diameters and microcapsules having large diameters are disclosed). While a mixture of microcapsules having different glass transition points is preferred, the suggestion to employ a mixture of microcapsules having different average particle diameters as an alternative is clear. The experimental modification of this prior art in order to ascertain optimum operating conditions (e.g., determine the difference between the diameters of the small and large microcapsules and the mass ratio of large particles to small particles) fails to render applicant's claims patentable in the absence of unexpected results.



BRUCE H. HESS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1300